

### REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the May 19, 2006 Office action and acknowledge the Office's statement that claims 1-10 and 23-25 are generic to species 1 and 2. (See Office action at page 2). Accordingly, applicants elect claims 1-10, 12-17, and 23-25 readable on Species 2 (processing a signal using a single processor) for examination. Although the Office only indicates that claim 11 is readable on Species 1 drawn to using two different digital signal processors for processing the first and second type of signals as shown in FIG. 6, applicants point out that claims 26 and 27 are also readable on Species 1, as they each recite processing first and second signals. Nevertheless, by this Amendment B, claims 11, 26 and 27 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 18-22 (species 3) have been canceled without prejudice to their patentability, and applicants expressly reserve the right to file a continuation application directed to these claims. Although applicants have elected claims 1-10, 12-17, and 23-25 for examination, applicants respectfully submit that upon allowance of any of the generic claims, that the election requirement between species 1 and 2 should be removed.

Applicants do not believe that the cancellation of claim 18-22 requires correction of inventorship under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 07-0846.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert O. Enyard, Jr. Reg. No. 57,780  
SENNIGER POWERS  
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 231-5400

ROE/axj